

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/884,392	CORNELISSEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	N. Bhat	1761	

**All Participants:**

(1) N. Bhat.

(2) Mr. McGowan.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 2 February 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, 2<sup>nd</sup> rejection on newly amended claims 4, 9.

Claims discussed:

4, 9, 10 and 13

Prior art documents discussed:

None

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In claims 4 and 9 applicant has used such as language which is a linking term, the examiner suggested deleting the recitation such as CitremLR10tm as this is trademarked and should not be used in claims. In claim 9, the such as lecithin was deleted but a dependent claim from claim 1 was suggested by applicant's rep to provide an emulsion according to claim 1 which is essentially free of lecithin which is now new claim 15. Claims 10 and 13 had minor typographical errors which were corrected by examiner's amendment. Changes to be made to the aforementioned claims were authorized by applicant's representative by Examiner's Amendment..